

Palmetto



PARTISAN

The Official Journal of the South Carolina Division of the Sons of Confederate Veterans

WWW.SCSCV.COM

February 2010

Boycott? What Boycott?

City, Benedict Sack NAACP

Apparently the NAACP economic boycott of South Carolina does not drive the decisions of either Benedict College or Columbia City Council. Although Benedict College and Columbia City Council would certainly not characterize their recent actions as defiant, the facts surrounding this aberration of politically correct protocol seems very suspicious and we are not buying their story.

The 2009 Pioneer Bowl, the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association (CIAA) championship game, was held at the Charlie W. Johnson Stadium, the 11,000 seat home field of Benedict College, a historically black college located in Columbia. The contest between the Tuskegee University Golden Tigers of Alabama and the Elizabeth City State University Vikings from North Carolina was held on December 5th. This game, by the way, is one of only three NCAA II sanctioned bowl games—one that also happens to be the only bowl game between historically black colleges.

Yet, somehow this NCAA-sanctioned (albeit, division II), post-season bowl game ended up in the very city where “the Confederate Flag” flies on the grounds of South Carolina’s Statehouse! How did this happen? What about the NAACP boycott of the state because of the flag? What about the NCAA decision not to schedule any post-season events in South Carolina until the NAACP’s boycott was called-off?

According to Benedict Athletic Director, Willie Washington, no one knew that the bowl was coming to Columbia until the week prior to the game—at least that is what is being claimed. This, despite the CIAA’s statement that the teams and the location of the bowl game was announced on November 18th—2 1/2 weeks before Washington claimed to have known. It was not until Washington discovered that the teams playing in the Pioneer Bowl were booking rooms in Columbia that he came to the conclusion that his school would in, fact, host the bowl.



After this amazing discovery, time was of the essence. According to *The State* newspaper, Mr. Washington appeared before Columbia City Council on December 3rd to ask for \$15,000 to help pay for the game. While council members reportedly called the short notice “irresponsible” on the part of the bowl organizers, they further said they did not want to pass up an opportunity to bring in what was estimated to be a crowd of 10,000 to Columbia.

According to Councilman E.W. Cromartie, “These guys [the football fans] are coming in with money. People are hurting, and these (fans) are going to spend more than \$100 per person. With a hotel room, that’s \$250 to \$500 per person. That’s a lot of money coming into our city.” With record unemployment numbers over twelve percent and Christmas

season around the corner most folks would welcome the extra income and exposure this game would bring to the Capitol City. Apparently the NAACP boycott never crossed the mind of the councilman or any other member, who magnanimously provided Washington with \$10,000 from the city’s hospitality tax contingency fund.

When asked by *The State* about the NAACP boycott, Mr. Washington declined to comment.

Benedict reported only 1,882 attended the game in the 11,000-seat stadium with more than 50% being recognized as local residents... NOT tourists from out of state. Some attendees questioned whether even 1,100 were there and pointed out many were actually children who do not spend any money.

See **Benedict**, on page 6

The Invasions of Fort Sumter

By Paul C. Graham, Associate Editor

In early December, 1860, anticipating the withdrawal of SC from the Union, congressmen from the Palmetto State met with President Buchanan concerning the situation in Charleston and received what they believed were assurances that the *status quo* of the military installations in the harbor would be maintained. After SC seceded on December 20, 1860, SC sent commissioners to Washington to negotiate the settlement of all questions arising from her withdrawal from the Union. The commissioners had barely arrived when news arrived on December 26 that Major Robert Anderson and his men, who had until then occupied Fort Moultrie, crossed the cold waters of Charleston Harbor to occupy Fort Sumter. Previous to Anderson’s actions, Fort Sumter was of little interest to Washington, despite numerous attempts by the State of SC to have it improved and garrisoned by the Federal government. However, from that time until the ongoing standoff erupted into an armed conflict, the little fort would serve as the focal point of whether or not the American doctrine of *government by consent of the governed* would remain the reality won and enjoyed by the generation of 1776 and their progeny for the previous four score years, or whether the government of Washington, DC, would maintain its territorial

monopoly by force of arms.

A recently discovered article from the *New York Times* (May 9, 1926) provides some interesting information regarding the ownership of Fort Sumter in 1861. ¹ In this article Professor Robert L. Preston argues that with regards to Fort Sumter, “Major Anderson occupied a piece of property that the United States had not the vestige of a right to occupy and which was under the ownership, jurisdiction, and sovereignty of the State of South Carolina exclusively.” This is based on his reading of SC’s *Statutes at Large*, which in 1805 provided the original provisions for the cessions of properties in Charleston Harbor to the Federal Government. According to the statutes,

That, if the United States shall not, within three years from the passing of this act, and notification thereof by



Above art by Karen Graham Shealy

the governor of this State to the Executive of the United States, repair the fortifications now existing thereon, or build such other forts or fortifications as may be deemed most expedient by the Executive of the United States on the same, and keep a garrison or garrisons therein, *in such case this grant or cession shall be void and of no effect.*²

Preston goes on to note that the fort was neither completed within the stipulated three years, nor by 1861. Furthermore, it had never been garrisoned until Anderson occupied it. Although he does not believe that the parties involved in 1861 were aware of this legality, Anderson nevertheless *in fact* acted unlawfully. Preston further states that the US could not even claim ownership by *adverse possession*, since the fort was never previously garrisoned.

Other attempts by SC to cede this property to the United States occurred over the years that followed. However, the

See **Sumter**, on page 7

What's Inside...

Standing Guard, Commander's message

2 Heritage Success, Oakwood Monument

5

Palmetto Partisan, Award Winner Again

2 Jefferson Davis, Charley Reese

5

Guest Editorial, Harvard's Disgrace

3 Historical Report, Reconstruction

5

Sesquicentennial, ... Train is Gaining Speed

4 Camp Classifieds, Advertise Here

7

Paul Harvey, The Rest of the Story

4 Heritage Education, Part 1 of 3-part Series

8

STANDING GUARD

Randy Burbage
SC Division Commander

Four years have quickly passed since I was elected South Carolina Division Commander at the 2006 Division Reunion held in Beaufort, SC. Shortly after being elected your Commander, I asked if you were ready to go to work because we had a lot to do. You, the membership, responded that you were. I asked you to put forth your best efforts to improve the South Carolina Division and preserve the memory of our ancestors.

You lived up to that promise to work hard and have accomplished a tremendous amount. We have the best Division newsletter in the Confederacy. We have conserved four flags in the Confederate Relic Room Museum collection. We are well on our way to recording the location of all Confederate Veterans graves in South Carolina. We presented the HL Hunley JROTC Medal at ninety-three SC high schools. We chartered five new camps. We cleaned up numerous neglected cemeteries containing the graves of Confederate veterans by participating in the Division's David Keller Cemetery Challenge. Our Guardian Program is strong and active. We just completed our third Leadership Conference and our Division is in sound financial condition. Plans are well underway for the beginning of the Sesquicentennial in December of this year. All of these significant accomplishments took a tremendous amount of hard work. I am very proud of all of you who have worked so hard to reach these significant goals.

It is a pleasure to lead men such as we have in our division, men who value their heritage and are willing to work hard to preserve it. General Robert E. Lee once said he was awed by the respect shown him by the men of the Army of Northern Virginia. While I am not trying to compare myself to the great general, I can certainly understand how he felt. I am awed by the respect the men of the South Carolina Division have shown me during my four year term. I greatly appreciate the opportunity to be your Commander. It has truly been an honor to serve as South Carolina Division Commander for the last four years. The best Division in the Confederacy is without a doubt in my mind the South Carolina Division. Thank you for allowing me to be your Commander.

Standing Guard for Our Ancestors,

Randy B. Burbage
Randy B. Burbage
SC Division Commander



Sharpsburg 2002, leading the 10th SC Infantry

The *Palmetto Partisan* is a benefit of membership in the South Carolina Division, Sons of Confederate Veterans. The Partisan is mailed, three times per year, to members in good standing. Delinquent members will receive the first issue after becoming delinquent as a reminder to reinstate. For those delinquent members, THIS IS YOUR LAST ISSUE. If you need more information about your current status, please contact your camp adjutant.

Palmetto PARTISAN

The Official Journal of the South Carolina Division of the Sons of Confederate Veterans

Joe Payne - Editor-In-Chief
Cindy Socia - Art Director/Designer

The *Palmetto Partisan* is published periodically by the South Carolina Division of the Sons of Confederate Veterans as a service to our members. Nonmembers may subscribe to the newsletter for \$20.00 per annum. It will be sent free of charge to libraries and to public and private schools upon request. Send all subscriptions to:

***Palmetto Partisan*, Attn: Division Adjutant, 3454 Toomer Kiln Circle, Mt. Pleasant, SC 29466 .**

The articles, photographs, or content of the *Palmetto Partisan* may not be reproduced without the consent of the Division Commander. The opinions expressed by the authors of signed articles reflect personal views of the writers and are not necessarily a statement of SCV policy. All articles and photos must be submitted to the Editor-In-Chief.

Commercial advertising may be purchased with the expressed approval of the Division Commander. Advertising rates are as follows: ¼ page \$300, ½ page \$200, business card \$100. All artwork and copy must be complete, the correct size and ready for print sent in high resolution file format to SCVGrfx@gmail.com. Remit to *Palmetto Partisan* address above.

"Camp Classified" ads are for the exclusive use of the Division Camps. Ads are 1 column width by 3" depth in size and must be submitted 30 days in advance of the next publication date. An artwork & design fee of \$65 is required prior to press date sent to *Palmetto Partisan* address above.

Services or products advertised do not carry SCV endorsement unless otherwise specified.

2010 South Carolina Division Convention

The 2010 South Carolina Division Convention will be an outstanding event honoring our Confederate ancestors. It will be a mixture of things old and of things new. It is an election year and there is much important business to discuss as we move ever closer to the observance of the Sesquicentennial of the War Between the States.

As for things old, there will be pieces. The display may include flags from the Relic Room, the CSS Pee Dee, uniform include his Darlington Guards frock coat.

This year's convention patterned after the one issued held in Florence, SC. At this attendees will receive one. first class featuring a Don with graphics and design Graphix.

As for things new, our the Southern Institute of Manu- on the campus of Florence- Attendees will be greeted by a giant confederate Generals from South Carolina. We will be taking full advantage of the technology at this state of the art facility to include video streaming of the speaker on giant screens around the room so there will not be a bad seat in the house.

Please make plans now to attend; the registration price is \$60 until March 1st. Get your registrations sent in now, do not wait until the last minute. It is very hard planning an event of this size. All the plans have been made, now we need you to attend. Do your part and help make this one of the best convention in South Carolina history.

Please visit our website at www.peedeerifles.homestead.com for registration forms, directions and additional information.



be an artifacts display of period clude recently conserved tillery shells recovered from items from Lt. Col. McIver to militia uniform and Confederate

memorabilia includes a medal at the 1923 U.C.V Reunion point, the first 200 registered The program will also be Troiani print on the cover by Rob Jones of Southern

convention hall will be at facturing Technology located Darlington Technical College.



Partisan Wins Prestigious National Award ... AGAIN!

The *Palmetto Partisan*, the official journal of the SC Division, was accorded the SCV's highest honor for publications at the recent 2009 National Reunion in Hot Springs, Arkansas at the grand and historic Arlington Hotel. The ***Dewitt Smith Jobe Award*** was presented to the SC Division at the Annual Awards Luncheon held on Friday, July 24th to Editor-in-Chief Joe Payne, by Division Cmdr. Randy Burbage proudly accepted the award on behalf of Joe and the entire South Carolina Division. Several hundred copies of the June issue were provided to many of the Reunion attendees from all across the Confederation with much praise and encouragement to continue our efforts the order of the day.

The *Palmetto Partisan* has been but one of the direct results of the \$5 Division dues increase enacted in Beaufort in 2006. Many Division members have made significant contributions to each issue. Graphic Designer, Cindy Socia, has insured that the Division's journal is second to none in appearance, graphics and print quality. Cindy has, in fact, been the recipient of the Division's Ladies Appreciation's Award at a past convention in Mt. Pleasant.

The ***Dewitt Smith Jobe Award*** is named in honor of Confederate martyr Pvt. Dee Jobe who, as a member of Coleman Scouts (Sam Davis' unit), was captured by an element of the 115th Ohio Regt and tortured beyond any

humanity. Pvt. Jobe, carrying special secret documents, was disarmed and bound, his eyes gouged out. His tongue was cut from his throat, and he was dragged to his death never divulging the secrets of the documents he had swallowed only moments before his capture. A "Google" on the internet of his name would be a worthy endeavor for all to learn the entire sad and horrific story of this incredibly brave and dedicated Confederate soldier.

SC Division Commander Burbage said, "The South Carolina Division is certainly humbled and honored to receive an award which is named in honor of Pvt. DeWitt Smith Jobe. I encourage everyone to read and learn of this truly great Confederate hero who made the ultimate sacrifice for his country at such a young age."

"The *Palmetto Partisan* has been one of the most effective tools we have implemented as a part of the Division Communication Initiative established at the Beaufort convention in 2006. I commend Joe and his staff for their hard work to publish a first class newsletter."

Ed_ A great number of individuals, far too many to list here, have unselfishly made significant contributions to the substance and quality of the editorials, articles, reports and the like in every single issue. I personally thank them here for their great effort, time and thoughtfulness in helping to make our journal the finest in the SCV.





Part of our charge from Lt. Gen. Stephen Lee states we are to give our strength to *“the emulation of his virtues, the perpetuation of those principles he loved.”* The greatest virtue the Confederate soldier had and the greatest principle he demonstrated was his love of and devotion to God.

During the late summer of 1864, the 49th Tennessee was in the worst of the fighting of Sherman’s Atlanta Campaign. The Regimental Chaplain, James McNeilly was conducting a worship service for his troops. They were so close to the line that a Yankee bullet hit one soldier in his brain and then the man next to him in his chest.

The congregation stopped singing and grabbed their rifles. They soon stopped and returned to their seats. After all, they had seen soldiers shot before in the act of worship. This was not something new.

The meeting was stopped as the dead man was removed and the wounded man taken to the surgeon. The drama made the men more reverent than before, and they continued the worship service.



Perhaps Chaplain McNeilly was preaching from Philippians 3:13-14 that day. *“Brothers, I do not consider myself yet to have taken hold of it. But one thing I do: Forgetting what is behind and straining toward what is ahead, I press on toward the goal to win the prize for which God has called me heavenward in Christ Jesus.”* These brothers in Christ knew that what was most important was their relationship to Christ. It was even more important than being out of the way of enemy fire. Many gave their lives during worship services.

How many of you missed going to your local worship services this week? The excuses are many; needed rest, had to go to a family meal, wanted to see the game, had an early tee time, the fish were biting, etc. Many churches were half full. Many a pew was empty. Many a blessing from God was missed.

Ed Westbury
SC Division Chaplain

Harvard’s disgraceful obeisance to Nazi Germany

By Les Kinsolving

The absolute disgrace with which the late British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain acceded to so many demands of Adolf Hitler – and then returned to England and declared: “We shall have peace in our time!” – will *never* be forgotten.

But what seems to have been largely forgotten is the similar detestable obeisance to Nazism paid by numerous leaders of leading U.S. universities.

This everlasting disgrace has now been monumentally reported by a Ph.D. from the Ivy League’s Columbia University, Stephen H. Norwood, who is professor of history at the University of Oklahoma.

Dr. Norwood’s new book, “The Third Reich in the Ivory Tower,” published by Cambridge University Press, is a carefully detailed and devastating written indictment of many of our nation’s college leaders.

But the most extensive of this book’s many exposes are those of our nation’s oldest and best-known university, Harvard.

I strongly recommend reading of this detailed set of historical accusations – and I recall that five years ago, after reading initial reports of professor Norwood’s research and contacting him by telephone I wrote a column for WorldNetDaily, which I also broadcast.

A copy of this column and broadcast, headlined, “Letter to the president of Harvard,” was registered-mailed to Harvard’s then-president, Dr. Lawrence Summers, before it was either published or broadcast.

President Summers declined to provide any response whatsoever, despite his personal invitation to me to write him.

Among the issues raised in that letter of Nov. 23, 2004, to President Summers, who during halftime of that year’s Yale-Harvard football game asked me to write him a letter about the questions I asked him on that football field, were:

1. What the Boston Globe on Nov. 14 headlined as: “Harvard’s stance on Nazis question: Historian calls ‘30s record ‘shameful.’” This expose, I learned, was picked up and reported by major dailies and talk radio nationwide; and
2. What the Globe and none of these major media have yet reported about Harvard’s memorial tablets to its alumni killed during World Wars I and II.

Harvard’s World War I memorial contains the names of two alumni who lost their lives serving in the German Army of the Kaiser. Following their names is, in parenthesis, the word “Enemy.”

This same designation of “Enemy” follows the name of a one-time Harvard Divinity School student who was killed on the Russian front after being drafted to serve in Adolf Hitler’s Wehrmacht.

If it is fitting and proper to so remember Harvard alumni who were our country’s German enemies, why is there no such memorial to more than 60 Harvard alumni who served in the armies of the Confederate States of America? (Yale, by contrast, remembers its six Confederate alumni who died in that war, on the same memorial with 10 Union casualties at Woolsey Hall.)

They included five Confederate generals (including a man named “States Rights Gist”) plus a number of graduates of the Harvard Medical School, who died while treating the wounded of both sides.

I learned from historian Stephen Norwood of the

University of Oklahoma that in 1934 the Harvard administration permitted Nazi Germany’s consul general to lay a wreath in the Harvard Chapel, beneath this World War I memorial to Harvard alumni killed in that war – including the two marked “Enemy.”

That wreath contained a swastika. I am not suggesting that because of this, the names of Harvard alumni “enemies” be removed. But if German Harvard enemy alumni are remembered, elementary equity requires that 60 American Harvard Confederate enemies be remembered as well.

What the Boston Globe and the media across this nation have reported is your neither attending, nor even being willing to send, a representative from Harvard to a Boston University conference on the Holocaust, where professor Norwood’s paper was titled “Legitimizing Nazism: Harvard University and the Hitler Regime.”

Should the incumbent president of Harvard either try to ignore and fail to dispute – rather than profoundly apologize for what has now been reported nationwide?

When I asked you about the Boston Globe’s two stories, you replied that you suppose there was some anti-Semitism in the 1930s at Harvard, but you asked me to write you a letter, and so I do.

The Boston Globe’s reporter, Marcella Bombardieri, with whom I talked on the phone – as I did with professor Norwood – reported among other things:

- In 1934, Harvard’s President James Bryant Conant, welcomed to his home for tea a Harvard alumnus of the Class of 1909 on his 25th anniversary. Ernst “Putzi” Hanfstaengl was Adolf Hitler’s foreign press secretary and close personal friend.
 - This invitation by President Conant was protested by 2,000 Harvard students, nine of whom were arrested and sentenced to six months at hard labor, while Harvard campus police tore down their anti-Nazi signs.
 - In this same year, when Nazi German battle cruiser Karlsruhe visited Boston, its crew and officers were hosted both on the Harvard campus, as well as at a banquet the Hotel Copley Plaza – where there was a stirring defense of Hitler’s government
 - The following year, on the occasion of the 550th anniversary of the University of Heidelberg – which had purged its faculty of all Jews – the festivities were attended by Joseph Goebbels, Heinrich Himmler and a delegation from Harvard.
- Of this, Harvard’s President Conant wrote in his autobiography:
- Even if one despised the regime in power, should not one be ready to build a scholarly bridge between two nations?*
- (By striking contrast, the president of Williams College terminated relations with all German universities, and Chancellor Harry Woodburn Chase of New York University declared that it was the duty of all “teachers, scientists and men of letters to resist with all their power” the Nazi higher education policies.)
- The Globe quoted retired University of Massachusetts Professor David Wyman, one of the leading scholars regarding America’s response to the Holocaust: “Harvard should issue an apology and say: ‘We as an institution would never conduct ourselves like that again.’”

The important role that the Sons of Confederate Veterans plays in our society today is well illustrated by the events described in the following story. Just last month a civic group in Columbia S.C. had as their speaker a Professor from the University of South Carolina who was giving a lecture about the destruction by fire of the city of Columbia on the night of February 17, 1865. You can imagine my shock when I was told that Wade Hampton’s Confederate troops were blamed for setting fire to some bales of cotton and it was these flames that caught the city on fire.



I was born in Columbia and I can tell this Professor that we know who burned our city down it was burned by the same people that burned down Atlanta...the same people who set fire to; Barnwell, Orangeburg, Lexington and Camden. After the War Between the States was over Union General Howard who had served as one of Sherman’s Corp Commanders was introduced to Wade Hampton who refused to shake General Howard’s hand until the former Union General admitted that Columbia was burned down by Yankee troops and General Howard told those present that it is a fact that the Yankees had been the ones who burned down Columbia. Even General Sherman himself cleared this issue up in his memoirs when he said that during the war he had blamed the destruction of the city of Columbia on General Hampton in order to undermine the people’s confidence in him. The physical evidence alone would clearly show that the city was burned down in too selective a pattern for it to be anything other than deliberate acts if arson as some churches were burned down while others were spared.

I have no doubt that the Professor who gave the lecture in question was just repeating what she had been taught on the subject but the real question is why was she taught a lie and the answer is because the truth wouldn’t be of much help to historians of this type because Sherman did burn down Columbia and Yankee General U.S. Grant did expel all of the Jewish families from the multi state area controlled by his Army. If you think the war was fought to free the slaves then reflect on the fact that Abraham Lincoln’s plan was to ship all of the former slaves back to Africa so the slaves would have been free...free to leave.

The fact is that our ancestors were fighting some very bad people and today we face those who are trying to rewrite history so that every thing connected to the Confederacy is evil and every thing associated with the Yankee invasion is somehow good or at least righteous. We have nothing to fear from this latest crop of revisionist for no matter how hard they may try to twist things history does not change only the historians do.

It is our duty to see that the true history of the South is presented to future generations and it will always turn out upon a close examination of the facts that it was our ancestors who were fighting to preserve the system of government left to us by Jefferson, Franklin and Washington. That will never change and remember ...SOUTHERN MEN DON’T NEED TO BOW.

Semper Southern
Don Gordon

President Summers, I agree with Dr. Wyman – as I believe almost all of our fellow Americans who know about this Harvard record would also agree.

What Harvard needs – and most of this nation wants – is a detailed and extensive apology from you. And what many of us will hope to see is a memorial not only to Harvard’s German alumni, but its Southern American alumni from 1861 to 1865.





SESQUICENTENNIAL — All ABOARD!

Celebrating 150 Years of Southern Pride

Jeff Antley
Chairman, SC Division
Sesquicentennial Committee



“Steam is up and the train is gaining speed”

Wow! Can you feel it? The Sesquicentennial energy that is, there’s a quote I often think of: “May you live in interesting times”. To those of us who honor our Southern Heritage this is our most interesting time.

Since my last column the Sesquicentennial Committee has been very busy. In the last article mention was made of the various sub committees, all have been working tirelessly to prepare the SC Division for the upcoming “interesting” time in our Southern History.

The education committee has been the primary focus of our initial efforts. A beautiful and informative Brochure has been produced that will enable us to reach our most precious asset: Our Children! This brochure along with grade specific lesson plans is in production to be made available for teachers at all grade levels. Contained in this issue is your copy of this wonderful tool that will be one of the primary tools of our education effort throughout the sesquicentennial years and beyond. Take this copy as your key to enable us to reach all of the citizens of our great Palmetto State. You may ask how I use this brochure. It is easy; show it to all educators, elected officials, teachers, friends, and business associates. Tell them the importance of educating our youth about the honor and valor of the Confederate soldier and the Southern people. Remember that this brochure is for our external educational outreach.

Monuments! Are you preparing to install some? The *Signers of the Ordinance Monument* is coming soon. Your help will be needed, be ready to own a piece of this historic event.



Secession Banner

The SC Division Sesquicentennial tee-shirt is done and is on the way! Plans are in the works to make it available to you as soon as possible. Please see the advertisement in this issue and stay tuned for more to come.

Gentleman we are now inside one year till the commemoration starts! What are your Camps plans? Are you prepared? Are you ready?

These are the important questions that your Sesquicentennial committee need answered. Please keep in contact with your Brigade representative as to the activities planned in your area.

Let’s keep the train moving!!

“Preserving our past, focusing on the future”



Jeff Antley
10th Brigade Commander
South Carolina Division
Sesquicentennial Chairman

Sesquicentennial Brochure

The special brochure contained herein has been carefully created and designed to provide the average school child a serious learning tool to use in his/her lessons during the Sesquicentennial period. It is but one of many “teaching tools” that will be provided for school lesson plans, civic group presentations, living history events and the like. The brochure is but one component of many items that have been or are being created for our educational outreach. It is unbiased and historically accurate to the best of our ability.

Know that it is **NOT** an SCV promotional or recruiting device. The distribution will be primarily for schools, tourists and the general public. Although it can also serve to help broaden the knowledge of SCV members, it is **NOT** intended for internal use and distribution. If you feel you have other good ideas for its effective use, do not hesitate to contact the Sesquicentennial Committee. We are open to any and all constructive ideas that will further our educational objective during the next 5 years.

Paul Harvey News:

His Views in 1965 ... *The Rest Of The Story!*

How long before the South will be forgiven?

The South lost a war 100 years ago and is still paying for it.

We forgave Germany twice in half that time.

In the 20 years since German fought us the last time, we’ve forgiven them and sent them \$4 billion.

In the 20 years since Japan lost its war with us, we have forgiven Japan and sent the Japanese \$2.5 billion.

It has been 100 years since Alabama and Georgia and Mississippi lost their war and Washington is still forcing those states to pay to Washington six times as much they receive in “aid.”

The economic jealousy which was, in large part, responsible for the UnCivil War is still apparent in the present North-South cold war.

Southern Negro slaves had security but fought for freedom. Today they have freedom, and seek security.

We have forgiven Germany and Japan and Spain and Mexico and everybody who ever waged war on us-except the Confederacy.

We have even promised North Viet Nam reparations in advance-a billion dollars aid per year if Southeast Asians will stop the war at the 17th parallel.

The Southern United States, entirely willing accept a cease fire at the Mason-Dixon line and peaceful coexistence wherever ... is still occupied by “the enemy.”

The Southern States have surrendered unconditionally. They are not threat to the security of their neighbors. They have no territorial ambitions beyond their borders. Indeed, you never even hear of a retired Southerner mov-

ing north. They mind their own business, contributing more than generously to the U.S. Treasury.

Washington would not think of meddling in the internal affairs of West Germany or Italy or Japan. It would be inexcusably bad manners. It would engender resentment. It would likely set the stage for another military confrontation.

Yet, Washington approves and applauds the invasion of own South by Yankee mobs and supports their continuing invasion with Federal troops.

Granted, the South made a mistake! It lost the war. But many others have lost many wars and Washington has generously helped the fallen to their feet, sponsored their reconstruction, reestablished their independence.

How long before the South will be forgiven?

Not one of Uncle Sam’s former enemies has become a better friend. Not one has stuck with him through peace and war, feast and famine, as has this one.

Uncle Sam has no ally on whom he can count as surely as on this splendid, energetic, dynamic segment of himself.

Isn’t it time to stop the masochistic punishment?

Isn’t three generations of spitting on Johnny Reb’s grave enough?

How long before the South will be forgiven?

If there had been no 2nd Amendment in 1861, the South could not have raised an army to defend itself against the invading Northern forces.

JOIN THE

NRA

COMING SOON IN THE JUNE ISSUE!

The June Palmetto Partisan will tell you
how you can make a real difference
by sponsoring one child or an entire classroom!

“...to see that the true history of the South is
presented to future generations”!

It’s all about the kids.

If we don’t do it,
then who will?



Jefferson Davis

By Charley Reese

Jefferson Davis, one of America's greatest statesmen, said that a question settled by violence would inevitably arise again, though at a different time and in a different form.

And so it has. Lovers and sycophants of the great empire on the Potomac must be feeling uneasy that at least some Americans are again questioning the efficacy of a gargantuan central government.

Perhaps the recent shift of control of Congress to the Democrats has made them nervous, though God knows there are precious few Jeffersonian Democrats in the modern Democratic Party.

And what, you might well ask, is a Jeffersonian Democrat? He's a person who hasn't forgotten that the sovereign states created the federal government, not the reverse, as some today seem to assume. He believes that what the Constitution created was a republic of sovereign states, and that the carefully limited powers assigned to the federal government were all the powers it had, in peace or in war. He believes the Constitution is a binding contract, not a rubbery document that can mean anything a judge or a politician says it means. He believes in a system of checks and balances. In short, he believes in the Declaration of Independence.

That document, you might recall, says that the only purpose of government is to protect rights already granted by God, and that when a government fails to protect those rights and begins to abuse them, the people have the right to alter or overthrow it. "Sounds communistic to me," grumbles old Jack Jingoist. "That guy Jefferson must have been some kind of a pinko."

Why else would Lord Acton, the great British philosopher of liberty, have written to Robert E. Lee, America's greatest soldier, that, "I grieve more for what was lost at Appomattox than I rejoice at what was gained at Waterloo." Lord Acton saw clearly what many American professors of history do not – that the defeat of the South was the end of America's experiment in liberty and

self-government and a conscious choice to emulate the central governments of Europe.

H.L. Mencken, the Baltimore journalist, in his usually blunt way said the only thing wrong with Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address was that it was the South, not the North, that was fighting for government "of the people, by the people and for the people."

Davis had said, "I love the Union and the Constitution, but I would rather leave the Union with the Constitution than remain in the Union without it."

On another occasion, he said: "We feel our cause is just and holy; we protest solemnly in the face of mankind that we desire peace at any sacrifice save that of our honor and independence. We ask no conquest, no aggrandizement, no concession of any kind from the states with which we were lately confederated; all we ask is to be let alone; that those who never held power over us shall not now attempt our subjugation by arms."

A newspaper in New Hampshire said: "The Southern Confederacy will not employ our ships or buy our goods. What is our shipping without it? We must not let the South go."

So to add to the definition of Jeffersonian Democrats, they were a majority of the Founding Fathers, a majority who fought the American Revolution, a majority who wrote the Constitution, and a majority who fought for Southern independence. No wonder the precious few still extant make big-government lovers so nervous.

Editor's note: Charley Reese has been a journalist for 49 years, reporting on everything from sports to politics. From 1969–71, he worked as a campaign staffer for gubernatorial, senatorial and congressional races in several states. He was an editor, assistant to the publisher, and columnist for the Orlando Sentinel from 1971 to 2001. He now writes a syndicated column which is carried on LewRockwell.com. Reese served two years active duty in the U.S. Army as a tank gunner. He is a regular contributor in the Southern Partisan magazine and is a member of the SCV.

Ed. For additional reading on Jefferson and Varina Davis link to Catholicism and the Old South by Gary Potter using the following link: <http://catholicism.org/catholicism-south.html>

Reconstruction and "Multiracial Democracy"

Readers might remember that in May, 2009, a couple of Yankee "bottom feeders" named Ed Sebesta and James Loewen, wrote a letter to Obama asking him to cease the annual presidential tradition of sending a wreath for placement at the Confederate monument in the Arlington National Cemetery. The activist duo cited several reasons for their request, not the least of which was that after the war, the Southerners resisted what they called the "multiracial democracy" of "Reconstruction" which Republican radicals had rammed down the South's throat.

Heaven forbid that anyone should utter criticisms of anything "multiracial" (or multicultural) in this day and age. Today, the common practice of simply placing that adjective in front of any noun automatically makes it a good thing, and we are then expected to run around screaming its praises regardless of whether or not it has any actual merit. It seems that the actual track record of the ex-slaves and black and white northern transplants who ran the South into the ground between 1867-76 has become irrelevant. The fact that this coalition was multiracial in nature makes it something to be praised. In a 2000 Seminar entitled "Rally on the High Ground," then Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt, praised the period as a time when black people went to the polls in extraordinary numbers and elected numerous black "leaders" who were "leaders in anti-discrimination legislation, public housing accommodations, and social services." Liberal historian Eric Foner, on several occasions, has praised "Reconstruction" as "a remarkable experiment in interracial democracy," and in at least one of the mini-movies at the new visitor's center in Gettysburg, built with your tax dollars and mine, "Reconstruction" is touted as a wonderful "biracial democracy."

Truth is truth, however. You can cover your eyes or put on blinders, but you can't take a cow chip and turn it into a piece of gold. Much about the period has been left out by these folks, and the average contemporary reader, unfamiliar with Reconstruction Period's merits (or lack of such), might need to be enlightened just a bit. So let's roll the historical "videotape!" For argument's sake, we'll use the term that our letter-writing agitators have given it – a "Multiracial Democracy."

"Reconstruction" was:

A "Multiracial Democracy" which excluded most of the native Southern white population. As per the 14th amendment - anyone who had engaged in "participation in any rebellion or civil war against the United States" was disenfranchised, thereby leaving state governments in the hands of Yankee transplants, ex-slaves and a few compliant Southerners who were willing to "swallow the dog."^[1]

A "Multiracial Democracy" administered, in part, by a people who had been slaves not more than 3 years before. This mysterious, and unbelievable leap of progress in so brief a time, unequaled in all of human history, has never been fully explained by Sebesta, by Loewen, by Foner, by Babbitt, by the Gettysburg Visitor Center, or anyone else for that matter. Yet, its incongruity was noted, even by Northerners of the period, who wondered at the curious nature of the Freedmen's bill...namely that - "It took the blacks under the protection of the Federal Government as if they were not able to take care of themselves, while the same persons who urged...the measure are the most clamorous to give this same dependent population a large share in the government of the country."^[2] The incongruity in question is easily explained however. If one wants to

See **Reconstruction**, on page 6



Some of the Compatriots that helped make it a reality. (L-R) Joe Wright, Kelly, Georgianah, & Cassie Barrow, Mike Pullen, John Sawyer, Frank Earnest, Lee Hart, Roy Pope, Grayson Jennings, Fred (Colonial Iron Works), Tom Davis

Sons of Confederate Veterans add fence around Oakwood monument

Contributions: Oakwood Restoration Fund, P.O. Box 114, Beaverdam, VA 23015

By Katherine Calos

Published: December 29, 2009 Richmond Times Dispatch

Sons of Confederate Veterans have made their first major improvement to Richmond's Oakwood Cemetery under an agreement with the city to maintain the Confederate portion of the property.

A \$35,000 iron fence was installed yesterday around the Soldiers' Monument by Colonial Iron Works of Petersburg, with meticulous oversight by F. Lee Hart III of Suffolk, chairman of the SCV Oakwood Restoration Committee. The fence reproduces a feature that disappeared about 1916.

The reproduction fence stands on top of 5,200 pounds of granite block.



Its design is based on a photo that shows what the monument looked like in the early 1900s.

A smaller section of identical fencing was replaced in 2008 around the grave of Lt. Duncan Campbell Stafford of South Carolina.

About 4,000 Virginia SCV



members are paying \$6 extra in dues each year to maintain the grounds "to higher standards befitting a National Military Cemetery," according to a statement of restoration goals.

The SCV also plans to place individual granite markers supplied by the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs on the graves of about 16,000 Confederate soldiers buried at Oakwood. Currently, a succession of small blocks identify the graves of three people apiece.

Three officers of the national SCV, which has donated \$50,000 to the restoration, braved a biting wind to watch yesterday's fencing project. Brag Bowling, commander of the Army of Northern Virginia, said he considered Oakwood to be comparable to Arlington National Cemetery in terms of its significance as a Confederate military cemetery.

"Arlington is row after row of properly dressed markers. That is what we want here," Bowling said. "People come here all the time looking for ancestors," but the small numerical blocks make it difficult to identify who's where.

"People will hear about this after it's finished. It will help the Richmond economy ... Richmond has neglected its Confederate history. It's important to our shared heritage."



Do you shop on-line?

Then **DON'T STOP!**

Just change how and where you do it. It's simple!

VISIT

<http://scv.we-care.com>

and you'll get the same great deals while supporting the SCV!

Try it once and see.



Celebrating 150 Years of Southern Pride

know the real motivation behind the Party of Lincoln and its drive to gain the elective franchise for the newly freed slave, one need only consult one of the chief architects of the Congressional Reconstruction policy, Rep. Thaddeus Stevens of Pennsylvania. In Stevens’ own words, the purpose of giving this “dependent population” the vote in the South was to “insure perpetual ascendancy to the party of the union.”^[3] Since when does one-party rule constitute a democracy, multiracial or otherwise? And if Stevens’ words aren’t enough proof, we have only to read the words of Reconstruction’s other architect, Senator Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts. When an astounded Secretary Welles asked him, “Do you really think that Massachusetts could govern Georgia better than Georgia could govern herself,” Sumner simply replied - “That, is Massachusetts’ mission!” Doesn’t sound like any form of democracy that I’ve ever heard of?! It sounds more like an occupation to me.^[4]

A “Multiracial Democracy” that even Frederick Douglass found, at least in part, appalling, as he commented on the white portion of Alabama’s 1869 Reconstruction state government - “Well, I would be a Democrat if I was a white man and had to herd with that cattle.”^[5]

A “Multiracial Democracy” that caused Georgia’s debt to go from “0” in 1865 to 50 million dollars in 1872^[6], whose budgetary practices in Louisiana caused the cost of the 1871 legislative session to be 9 ½ times the average cost of a pre-Reconstruction session^[7], and whose budgetary practices in the South Carolina legislature caused the total cost of 6 years of Reconstruction for that not-so-august body to total \$2,339,000, (when the average cost of a pre-Reconstruction session of the legislature had been \$20,000/year!)^[8]. This wonderful “multiracial democracy” resulted in the tax rate in Mississippi increasing 14 fold during its 5 year tenure in that state and caused 1/5 of all privately owned land in that state to be put up for sale on the tax auction block^[9]. In Texas, this wonderful “multiracial” experiment resulted in a 400% tax increase, while at the same time, another Southern state, Tennessee, saw its state debt inflated by 16 million dollars.^[10] It was a “multiracial democracy” which saw ¼ of all the property in Little Rock Arkansas in the hands of former Union General Schenck, who had purchased said property at bargain basement prices after those properties had been confiscated for non-payment of taxes.^[11] It was a “multiracial democracy” which saw, in South Carolina, the expenditure by the “multiracial” legislature, “of \$200,000 - all of which was spent in furnishing the state capitol with costly plate glass mirrors, lounges, arm chairs, a free bar and other luxurious appointments for the use of the [“multiracial”] legislators.”^[12]

A “Multiracial Democracy” [in South Carolina] composed of black men like Beverly Nash, who admitted to taking a \$2500 bribe, and who defended his actions with the words, “I merely took the money because I thought I might as well have it and invest it here as for them to carry it outside the state”.^[13] That same type of government, in that very same state, also produced the likes of State Representative John Patterson, a (white) Pennsylvania transplant, who, when questioned about corruption flippantly replied, “Why there are still 5 good years of stealing left in South Carolina”.^[14] In Mississippi, it produced the likes of William Gray, a black State Senator, who proclaim “that he would win [the 1874 election] if he had to kill every white man, woman and child in the county, which was predominantly black.”^[15]

A “Multiracial Democracy” which demanded that the black man have his vote, but which also mandated that the black man vote the way he was told! Black men contemplating a vote for the Democratic ticket (or the Conservative Ticket), were warned off with “*Death to Colored Democrat*” signs in polling places, and with banners proclaiming “*Every man that don’t vote the Radical ticket this is the way we want to serve him – hang him by the neck.*”^[16]

Finally, that “multiracial democracy” produced a financial house of cards which collapsed upon the head of the freedman in 1874 when the Freedman’s Bureau Savings and Trust went belly-up. Those freedmen who had worked hard to build an economic base for themselves (instead of feeding at the public trough), and who had trusted in their Yankee benefactors, lost all they had (a grand total of 3 1/3 million dollars – a huge sum for that time). And the government whose soldiers allegedly “*died to make men free*” did nothing to compensate them.^[17] No bailouts in 1874 I guess?!

But it’s all ok you see. Because it was all “**multiracial!**”!

I suppose I should close out this article by saying something witty or profound. But, my attempts at such would pale in comparison to the journalist in England, who, writing in October 1865 for “The Quarterly Review,” [Volume 118, pp. 106-136] saw right through the North’s desperate attempts to confer the elective franchise on the newly freed slave. His observations, for their time, were prophetic, and accurate.

“Can there be a dozen field Negroes in all the South who could even pronounce the word “suffrage”, or who can be supposed to have the faintest idea of what such a word means? The other day slavery was said to have brutalized the race until nothing was left but the mere shape of humanity. Now they suddenly appear as the most loyal, intelligent, praiseworthy, lovable of mankind – devoted to Constitutional principles, admirers of Northern character, worthy of the fullest privileges of citizenship.It is curious that when the Southern man was to be maligned, he had reduced the Negro to a brute; but when there is an object to be gained by the discovery, the same Negro is found to be an angel. The meaning of all this can easily be discerned. The Republican Party have an idea that when the South recovers from its present prostration, it may send members to Congress who may not be as they wished. Now in several of the States the Negroes equal the white population in number, and it is assumed they will be entirely controlled by the Northerners who go down to settle in the country. The latter, with the Negro vote in their hands, of course, will carry every election, and produce the same result as if the Southerners were deprived in the future of all representation. This cunning scheme of course is made to wear a virtuous and lofty form; it is another proof of moral growth’.”

**Deo Vindice,
Raphael-Waldburg Zeil
McGowan Camp # 40, Laurens
Europe Camp # 1612**

[1] See the 14th Amendment
[2] Ralph Seth Henry, “The Story of Reconstruction February, 1866 Page 160 (Konecky & Konecky, 150 Fifth Ave. New York, NY, 10011)
[3] *ibid*, PP. 210- 211
[4] “The Story of Reconstruction,” By Ralph Seth Henry, Page 135
[5] “Brooklyn Eagle,” copied in “Montgomery Advertiser”, Feb 19, 1869

[6] Mildred Lewis Rutherford, “The Truths of History,” Pages 128-129, Daniel Voorhees, Representative from Indiana, “Plunder of Eleven States”, a speech made in the House of Representatives March 23, 1872:
[7] Ella Lonn, “Reconstruction in Louisiana after 1868,” New York, 1918, P. 78
[8] “Republican Governor Daniel Chamberlain’s Reflections” 1901, in the Atlantic Monthly
[9] John S. Tilley, “The Coming of the Glory,” page 256, Copyright 1949, (Bill Coats, Ltd., 1406 Grandview, Nashville, TN, 37215-3030, 1995)
[10] *ibid*, page 259
[11] “Albany Argues”, copied “Montgomery Advertiser,” November 29, 1868
[12] Mildred Lewis Rutherford, “The Truths of History,” Page 127, Copyright, 1920, Southern Lion Books Inc., PO Box 347163, Atlanta, Ga., 30334, 1998, (as quoted in Muzzey’s “American History”, page 486)
[13] John S. Tilley, “The Coming of the Glory,” page 241, Copyright 1949, (Bill Coats, Ltd., 1406 Grandview, Nashville, TN, 37215-3030, 1995)
[14] *ibid*, page 232
[15] Claude G. Bowers, “The Tragic Era,” Page 453 Simon Publications, PO 321, Safety Harbor, FL., 2001, c 1929
[16] “The Southern Argus,” August 25, 1869
[17] House- Misc. Doc No. 16, 39, Cong 2 Sess. pp 61, 91



Salute from the European front
Raphael Waldburg-Zeil is an Associate member of the McGowan Camp #40 in Laurens and the Europe Camp #1612. He also holds the ceremonial title of “SCV Ambassador to Spain.” Born in Basel, Switzerland, in 1966, Raphael Waldburg holds a B.A. degree as language translator and journalist from State College in Karlsruhe, Germany. After serving in the German Army, including 2 years at the former International LRRP School Weingarten, 1990 he started to work as a journalist for German and Spanish military magazines. He is specialized in former Warsaw Pact/Soviet military and 19th Century Military History. He is married with no children and lives currently in both Germany and Spain.

Plan to attend the
2010 SC Division State Convention
March 26-27
Florence, South Carolina



We know that Columbia is always looking for a way to replenish their coffers and cannot be blamed for finding a way to generate tax revenue, but this does not explain Benedict’s apparent indifference to the economic boycott? If one uses Benedict’s attendance data, it would suggest that around 900 attended as bona fide tourists. If Councilman Cromartie’s statement that each tourist would spend \$100 of which there would be a 10%-20% retail profit to the local businesses, the event produced maybe \$9,000 to \$18,000 actual economic impact. At 8% of the \$9,000 to \$18,000 spent by tourists it would return only \$720 to \$1440 to the City, thereby showing a significantly Bad ROI—return on investment! One has to wonder how much was returned to the City’s coffers via the taxes generated.

The only person who seems to be concerned with the boycott in this whole affair was Lonnie Randolph, director of the South Carolina NAACP, who stated that he did not support the game coming to Columbia because it conflicts with his organization’s boycott of South Carolina due to the fact the Confederate flag flies on the State House grounds. Immediately after Mr. Randolph made his comments, representatives from the Pioneer Bowl, Benedict, Elizabeth City, Tuskegee, and the Columbia City Council told Randolph there would be no race card tactics being played here. There was a time when these same groups supported Randolph. Benedict went so far as to move their homecoming games to Charlotte a few years ago, but they along with so many organizations just simply ignored him for attempting to stop progress in the state. “Little Randolph” must feel the knife in his back and is nearly out of boycott supporters.

This had to be a stunning defeat for Randolph as he was still glowing over being a useful partner to Atlantic Coast Conference Commissioner John Swofford moving the

ACC baseball tourney out of Myrtle Beach to Greensboro, North Carolina earlier this year. What kind of message is this sending to athletes and their teams wishing to compete at a beautiful beach city and then denying them of this opportunity? Maybe we can follow the trail leading to these decisions? “Follow the Money”! Do these changes have anything to do with the fact that John Swofford is a native of North Carolina, an alumnus and past athletic director at University of North Carolina? Could it be because Food Lion, LLC their major corporate sponsor is headquartered in Salisbury, North Carolina? One could suppose it was more about taking care of friends and sharing the wealth in his home state than Ol’ Lonnie still complaining about the Confederate Battle flag on the State House grounds. Neither of these shameful individuals or the organizations that represent should be trusted.

While *The State* may be unclear why the game was organized on such short notice, it appears quite obvious: the disclosure of the bowl game was done at the eleventh hour to bypass the boycott and make it too late for the public to raise much of a fuss.

By feigning ignorance for the scheduling of the game and with the clock ticking, Benedict could shift the responsibility for this “oversight” to bowl organizers and Columbia City Council could claim the practical expediency of preparing for 10,000 tourists, while rebuking the bowl planners for their “irresponsibility.” Was this a shuck and jive? Yes it was. However, one can’t blame them for their actions. In fact, some might find their actions commendable.

Why should the city turn away tourists on whom they depend for tax revenue? Why should Benedict College be expected to follow in lock step with the unreasonable whims of the South Carolina NAACP when they could host a bowl

game? Of course, there is no reason.

The only lamentable part of this whole affair is that parties felt they had to be dishonest in order to appear not to be in defiance to the NAACP boycott.

Perhaps one day Benedict and others who bow and scrape before the NAACP will learn to stand up and honestly state their intentions without fear of retribution! They will never be free until they do.

POST SCRIPT:
The State, as one might expect, was busy promoting the NAACP annual “King Day at the Dome” as January 18th approached. In the run up to the event, Randolph cited the Atlantic Coast Conference’s decision to move its postseason baseball tournament elsewhere after awarding it to Myrtle Beach. He said the ACC, SEC and NCAA are still honoring the NAACP’s boycott and are not bringing events to South Carolina. He further stated, “Ten years later we have real good support.”

The facts, however, do not support Randolph’s assessment of the situation.

The State did not question Randolph on the impact of the Pioneer Bowl having already been played in Columbia or the O-D bowl game featuring the elite senior high school football players from around the country coming to Myrtle Beach on Jan 2 to showcase their talent, where Coaches from the major university’s attended in their annual recruiting frenzy.

By not allowing facts to get in their way, the ailing newspaper has shown itself to be a shill for the politically correct agenda of the NAACP and others who seek to divide, through deception and fraud, the good people of SC.

In the end, the facts surrounding the waning support of the boycott never reached the podium during King Day at the Dome. Randolph and other speakers wooed the audience with talk of the impact of their unified front and promises of victory. We opine that they will continue to misrepresent their strength and the will of their opponents until it is too late to withdraw from this contest with honor if that hour has not already passed. As long as there is one son willing to defend the good name of his Confederate ancestor, you can rest assured that the war they make on our dead will be a losing battle.

EDITOR’S NOTE: The development of this editorial is the collaborative effort of *PPJ* Associate Editors Paul C. Graham and John H. Harris.

fact remains that statutes referenced above were never rescinded and the fort was neither completed nor garrisoned when Anderson occupied it in 1861. If legal issues regarding ownership were at least questionable when SC was in the Union, they were even more complex when she seceded. It was unthinkable that Charleston Harbor should be occupied by troops belonging to the government from which she had just seceded.

For South Carolinians, the meanings of Anderson's actions could only be interpreted as an act of aggression by a representative of a foreign government that had no intentions of evacuating the garrisons in the harbor, and, more importantly, was preparing for hostilities.

The next act of aggression came when President James Buchanan dispatched the *Star of the West* to Fort Sumter with supplies, reinforcements, and (secreted) troops. On January 9, 1861, this ship entered the waters of Charleston Harbor, but was quickly repulsed by the SC troops then occupying Fort Moultrie. Given Buchanan's reneging on maintaining the military *status quo* in Charleston Harbor and his refusal to negotiate a peaceful evacuation of Fort Sumter, it is hardly surprising that the presence of a vessel dispatched by him was viewed as yet another act of hostility. This was yet further evidence that the US government was preparing for war against the Palmetto State. No further provocative actions were undertaken by Buchanan. It would be his successor, Abraham Lincoln, who would decide whether or not the voluntary union of, by, and for the people of the several states, would perish from the earth.

The final outrage occurred on March 28, 1861, when the newly installed president of the US, Abraham Lincoln, ordered a "relief expedition" of several ships to Fort Sumter. By this time SC was no longer standing alone. She had joined with other seceding states under the Confederate States of America. The implications of continuing to menace Charleston Harbor were now far more profound than before, a fact of which Lincoln was fully aware.

Previous to this dispatch of ships, a game of diplomacy, political posturing, and double talk had been employed by Lincoln and his administration to prepare for the final ruse: to induce the South to fire first, and thus claims that it was the South that inaugurated the war.

That Lincoln had no intention to cede Fort Sumter, despite the assurances of his Secretary of State, William Seward, and other prominent intermediaries is well documented. These negotiations only served to buy Lincoln time to prepare and execute the aforementioned expedition *peacefully if possible, by force if necessary*.

When the Confederate government was made aware of the planned invasion, they naturally objected. Authorization was given to General P.G.T. Beauregard to demand the surrender of Fort Sumter. Enough was enough!

On the early hours of April 12, 1861, after a rebuffed offer of an honorable evacuation, Confederate forces opened fire. Lincoln's ships arrived several hours later, but did not approach the fort—they maintained a safe distance as they watched Major Anderson and his men endure almost 36 hours of hostile fire. At length, Fort Sumter was surrendered and Major Anderson and his men were permitted, with every courtesy, to retire. The ships that menaced Charleston Harbor likewise retired.

Although Sumter fell, Lincoln was pleased with the outcome. Orville H. Brown, a longtime friend and confidant of Lincoln, in a journal entry dated July 3, 1861, reveals that Lincoln had anticipated the Southern response all along. According to Brown's account, Lincoln said that he "conceived of the idea, and proposed sending supplies, without an attempt to reinforce giving notice of the fact to Gov. Pickens of S.C. The plan succeeded. They attacked Sumter—it fell and did more service than it otherwise could."

How did the fallen Fort provide service to the Union? It provided the cover for Lincoln to inaugurate a full scale invasion of the South

and the ability to forever change the political landscape of America—a revolutionary and unconstitutional act that forever destroyed the government of the founders.

Although an article of this length can only provide a surface reading of the issues, it is



hoped that the forgoing places the "first shots of the war" in their proper historical context. If ever there was a justification for armed resistance, the repeated provocations in Charleston Harbor provide one with much to consider. Lincoln's invasion, although more sophisticated than the previous two, was nevertheless an act

of war. To insist that SC should have continued to suffer the outrages perpetrated upon her by the US government is lunacy. What man, in his right mind, would wait for an intruder to strike first—thus exposing himself and his family to the unknown whims of a criminal invader—before driving him from his home? It is simply unthinkable!

The South did not travel to Union soil or ports to fire the first shot of the war, they fired in their own back yard. In fact, they fired long after most reasonable persons would have or, perhaps, should have. The real question regarding the affair at Fort Sumter is not why the South fired upon the fort, but rather why the US government continued to harass, occupy, and invade the fort and surrounding harbor. Neither South Carolina, nor the Confederate government could have acted otherwise with honor. After repeated acts of aggression and numerous offers of negotiated peace, the firing on Fort Sumter was not an act of hostility, but rather, a justifiable act of defense!

ENDNOTES:

- 1 "Title to Governors Island: Rights of the Federal Government and the State of New York as Set forth in the Old Statutes." *The New York Times*. May 9, 1926. p. X14. This reference comes from an article entitled "Fort Sumter in 1861" published in the *Confederate Veteran*, Vol. XXXIV, No. 9., September 1926. p. 325. The writer became aware of its existence when it was recently reprinted in Charles Demastus' electronic newsletter, *Southern Heritage News and Views* (see www.shnv.org).
- 2 *The Statues at Large of South Carolina*, Vol. 5 (Containing the Acts from 1786, exclusive, to 1814, inclusive) Edited under the authority of the Legislature by Thomas Cooper, M.D., L.L.D. Columbia, SC: A.S. Johnson, 1839. p. 501. Emphasis added.
- 3 "Orville H. Browning's Diary" at *Crisis at Fort Sumter*. <http://www.tulane.edu/~sumter/Reflections/LinRealistComm.html> (Accessed 31 December 2009).

South Carolina Statehouse 2009 Christmas tree topper



CAMP CLASSIFIEDS

See classified
and ad rates on page 2

Camp Classifieds

Your Camp can reach out to the entire Division to promote and advertise its special projects and events!

It's simple. Just send your text copy and photos to the Editor-in-Chief for approval. You will reserve a professionally designed, attractive color ad, 2 1/2" x 3". The space is **FREE**, but there is a small \$65.00 artwork fee for each ad per issue. All text copy must be submitted in MS Word and all photos must be full file in JPEG format. Your artwork fee must be received by the Division Adjutant before publication: Jan. 15 for the Feb. issue; May 15 for the June issue and Oct. 15 for the Nov. (holiday) issue

ADVERTISE IN THE Palmetto Partisan

The *Palmetto Partisan* will open its pages to commercial business advertisers. Although the maximum allowable size will be 1/4 page, 5 1/2 x 8 1/2, your full color, high impact ad will reach over a thousand non-members and elected officials, as well as business and education leaders across South Carolina.

If you would like more information about this unique marketing opportunity kindly send an email inquiry to SCVGrfx@gmail.com Rates are listed on page 2, lower left.

State of South Carolina Sons of Confederate Veterans License Plate



Available statewide at all DMV licensing offices.
To purchase the SCV license plate you must
show a current and valid SCV membership card.
GET YOURS TODAY!



SC Confederate Relic Room and Military Museum

Exhibiting Artifacts
from the Revolutionary
War through the
Present



301 Gervais Street, Columbia, 29201
www.crr.sc.gov 803-737-8095

Their Words Still Resonate Today! *First of a 3-Part Series*

“Any people anywhere, being inclined and having the power, have the right to rise up, and shake off the existing government, and form a new one that suits them better. This is a most valuable, a most sacred right - a right which we hope and believe is to liberate the world. Nor is this right confined to cases in which the whole people of an existing government may choose to exercise it. Any portion of such people that can, may revolutionize, and make their own, of so much territory as they inhabit.”
– Abraham Lincoln, 12 January 1848, in a speech in Congress

“So far from engaging in a war to perpetuate slavery, I am rejoiced that slavery is abolished.”
– General Robert E. Lee, CSA

“There are few, I believe, in this enlightened era who would not agree with me that slavery as an institution is a moral and political evil.” – General Robert E. Lee, CSA

“I wish to see the shackles struck from every slave.”
– Lt. General Thomas J. “Stonewall” Jackson, CSA

“Every man should endeavor to understand the meaning of subjugation before it is too late... It means the history of this heroic struggle will be written by the enemy; that our youth will be trained by Northern schoolteachers; will learn from Northern school books their version of the war; will be impressed by the influences of history and education to regard our gallant dead as traitors, and our maimed veterans as fit objects for derision... It is said slavery is all we are fighting for, and if we give it up we give up all. Even if this were true, which we deny, slavery is not all our enemies are fighting for. It is merely the pretense to establish sectional superiority and a more centralized form of government, and to deprive us of our rights and liberties.”

– Maj. General Patrick R. Cleburne, CSA,
January 1864, writing on what would happen if the Confederacy were to be defeated
“Only a despotic and imperial government can coerce seceding States.”

– William Seward, US Secretary of State under Abraham Lincoln,
to Charles Francis Adams, minister to England, 10 April 1861

“In saving the Union, I have destroyed the Republic.” – Abraham Lincoln

“The sole object of this war is to restore the Union. Should I become convinced it has any other object, or that the Government designs its soldiers to execute the wishes of the Abolitionists, I pledge you my honor as a man and a soldier I would resign my commission and carry my sword to the other side.”
– General Ulysses S. Grant, USA, in a letter to the *Chicago Tribune*, 1862

“I am not in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office... I am not in favor of Negro citizenship.” – Abraham Lincoln

“Good help is so hard to come by these days.” – General Ulysses S. Grant, USA,
explaining why he didn’t free his slaves until the passage of the
13th Amendment, *after* the war

“The more Indians we can kill this year, the less will have to be killed next year, for the more I see of these Indians, the more convinced I am that they all have to be killed or be maintained as a species of paupers.” – General William T. Sherman, USA

“Help me to dodge the nigger - we want nothing to do with him. I am fighting to preserve the integrity of the Union and the power of the Government - on no other issue. To gain that end we cannot afford to mix up the negro question - it must be incidental and subsidiary. The President is perfectly honest and is really sound on the nigger question.” – General George B. McClellan, USA

“My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union, and is not either to save or to destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing any slave I would do it, and if I could save it by freeing all the slaves I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone I would also do that.”
– Abraham Lincoln, 22 August 1862,
in a letter to Horace Greeley, editor of the *New York Tribune*

“I will say, then, that I am not, nor have ever been in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races... I am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race.” – Abraham Lincoln

“I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so.” – Abraham Lincoln, 14 March 1861, First Inaugural Speech

“I am a little uneasy about the abolishment of slavery in this District [of Columbia]...”
– Abraham Lincoln, 24 March 1862,
in a letter to Horace Greeley, *New York Tribune* editor

“Amend the Constitution to say it should never be altered to interfere with slavery.”
– Abraham Lincoln, 24 December 1860, presenting his stand on slavery to the Senate



“To you, Sons of Confederate Veterans, we will submit the vindication of the cause for which we fought. To your strength will be given the defense of the Confederate Soldier’s good name, the guardianship of his history, the emulation of his virtues, the perpetuation of those principles he loved and which made him glorious and which you also cherish. Remember, it is your duty to see that the true history of the South is presented to future generations.”

The Charge is the official “Mission Statement of the Sons of Confederate Veterans”

Lt. Gen. Stephen Dill Lee
Commander General, United Confederate Veterans Reunion at New Orleans, 1906



SOUTH CAROLINA DIVISION • SONS OF CONFEDERATE VETERANS
3454 TOOMER KILN CIRCLE • MT. PLEASANT, SC 29466



Nonprofit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Columbia, SC
Permit #1186

February 2010

The *Palmetto Partisan* is the official publication of the South Carolina Division of the Sons of Confederate Veterans.